IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 8823 of 2006

DATED: 20.11.2006

Between:
S.K.MEERAIAH **PETITIONER**

AND

The A.P. State Irrigation Development Corpn Ltd
And others
RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V.RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO. 8823 OF 2006

ORAL ORDER:

This writ petition is filed questioning the action of the first respondent in not disposing of the representation filed by the petitioner dated 12.9.2005 to consider his case for re-appointment in the available vacancies.

Admittedly, the petitioner, who was employed in the respondent corporation as "Watchman" has opted for voluntary retirement and accordingly relieved from the services of the respondent organization vide proceedings dated 25/26-10-2002. The petitioner alleges that the respondent corporation issued proceedings dated 7-9-2002 stating petitioner was identified as surplus staff and brought under VRS and that if he does not opt for VRS he will be retrenched under the Staff Regulations/Industrial Disputes Act and that under pressure he has opted for Voluntary Retirement and was relieved from services vide proceedings dated 25/26-10-2002. The grievance of the petitioner is that some of the employees, including his juriors have not opted for the VRS scheme and approached the Court of law and are being continued in service in terms of the Court directions. The petitioner filed W.P No. 18343 of 2005 before this Court and states that by order dated 19.8.2005 interim directions were granted in W.P.M.P. No. 23340 of 2005 directing the respondents to consider the case of the

petitioner, if the respondent corporation is appointing any watchman. Thereafter the petitioner submitted a representation dated 12.9.2005 requesting to reappoint him in a suitable and available vacancy. Alleging that no action is taken on the said representation, the present writ petition is filed.

Heard the learned counsel for petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj. Both counsel agreed for disposal of the writ petition at the admission stage directing the respondents to dispose of the representation of the petitioner expeditiously.

In view of the agreed stand taken by both the counsel, without going into the merits of the matter, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition directing the first respondent to dispose of the representation of the petitioner dated 12.9.2005 in accordance with law, expeditiously.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

_____

N.V.RAMANA,J

DATE: 20.11.2006
TVK

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 8823 of 2006

DATED: 20.11.2006

-

-

-